

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 10, 17, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (5,435,671).

The Examiner rejected claims 6-9, 12-13, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (5,435,671), and in further view of Frater (6,355,360).

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (5,435,671), and further in view of Block (4,269,549).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 2-5, 10, 17, 32, and 33

The Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 10, 17, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (5,435,671).

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 4 and 17 are not unpatentable over Hatch in view of Weinreich, because Hatch in view of Weinreich does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 4. For example, Hatch in view of Weinreich does not teach or suggest the features:

"wherein successive sheets in each pair of successive sheets of the stack are adhesively coupled to each other by **an adhesive layer consisting of a removable adhesive**, wherein the adhesive layer is in direct mechanical contact with the successive sheets in each pair" (emphasis added) (claim 4); and

"wherein each stack comprises a plurality of sheets such that each sheet and its adjacent sheet of the plurality of sheets are adhesively coupled to each other with **an adhesive layer consisting of the removable adhesive**, wherein the adhesive layer is in direct mechanical contact with said each sheet and its adjacent sheet" (emphasis added) (claim 17).

The Examiner argues that "[t]he removable adhesive is in the form of a lubricant ...". In "Response to Arguments", the Examiner further argues: "Hatch teaches that the lubricant is a wax-based material (Column 5, lines 40 - 48) and teaches that exhibits adhesive properties when the lubricant adheres to the substrates is a dry, hardened form (Column 3, lines 55 - 62). As shown in Figure 30, the lubricant is in the form of a sheet which is placed in between the layers

of printed circuit boards, thereby adhesively coupling the first and second layers to the first second surfaces of the stack and adjacent stacks. Since the adhesive is a wax material, it is removable by the application of heat."

In response, Applicants contend that Hatch, FIG. 2 shows "a lubricating sheet 30 which has been impregnated with a water soluble dry film lubricant. The lubricating sheet includes a thin, flat carrier sheet 31 having its opposite faces coated with a water soluble dry lubricating film 32 according to principles of this invention. The carrier sheet is preferably a porous water-dissolvable paper sheet. The dry film lubricant is absorbed into the pores of the paper sheet as well as coating the faces of the sheet as a thin film"(see Hatch, col. 5, lines 16-24).

Therefore, Hatch does not disclose the preceding feature of claims 4 and 17 reciting the "consisting of" language, since the alleged adhesive layer 30 in Hatch includes the flat carrier sheet 31 comprising paper which is not a removable adhesive.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 4 and 17 are not unpatentable over Hatch in view of Weinreich, and that claims 4 and 17 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-3, 5, 10, 32, and 33 depend from claim 4, Applicants contend that claims 2-3, 5, 10, 32, and 33 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claims 6-9, 12-13, and 34-37

The Examiner rejected claims 6-9, 12-13, and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (5,435,671), and in further view of Frater (6,355,360).

Since claims 6-9, 12-13, and 34-37 depend from claim 4, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Hatch in view of Weinreich under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claims 6-9, 12-13, and 34-37 are likewise not unpatentable over Hatch in view of Weinreich and further in view of Frater under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

35 U.S.C. §103(a): Claim 11

The Examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hatch et al. (4,929,370) in view of Weinreich (5,435,671), and further in view of Block (4,269,549).

Since claim 11 depends from claim 4, which Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Hatch in view of Weinreich under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants maintain that claim 11 is likewise not unpatentable over Hatch in view of Weinreich and further in view of Block under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: _____

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850